

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the following remarks. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-39, 42-46, 51-53 and 61-63 were previously canceled.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 40-41, 47-50 and 54-60 will be pending in the present application, with claims 40 and 56 being independent.

**1. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

**A. Rejections Based on Bisdikian et al. and Davis et al.**

The Office Action rejects claims 40-41, 47, 50, 54-57 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bisdikian et al. (US 6,047,317) in view of Davis et al. (US 5,559,548). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action on page 3 concedes that Bisdikian et al. fails to teach means for determining which pages in the carousel contain links to the new page, means for modifying metadata for each page in the carousel containing links to the new page, means for determining which pages in the carousel are linked to by the new page, and means for modifying metadata for the new page for each page in the carousel that is linked to by the new page. However, the Office Action maintains its assertions that Davis et al. teaches these features (citing col. 20, lines 43-47). Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertions regarding Davis et al.

Davis et al. teaches a system and method for information display of an electronic program guide. In one of the embodiments (relied on in the Office Action), Davis et al. discloses that its disclosed passive electronic program guide may be combined with an interactive program guide (see col. 19, line 66 to col. 20, line 1). The Office Action cites to col. 20, lines 43-47 of Davis et al., which discloses:

In addition, the application software for implementing or updating the interactive portion of the electronic program

Response to Office Action  
Application Number: 09/895,452  
Attorney Docket Number: 92819.02  
Filing Date: 06/29/2001

guide may also be transmitted from the cable head-end to subscribers. (emphasis added).

However, Davis et al. fails to explain exactly how the transmitted application software updates the interactive portion of the electronic program guide. As a result, Davis et al. also fails to teach or suggest the specific steps of (d) determining which pages in the carousel contain links to the new page; (e) modifying metadata for each page in the carousel containing links to the new page; (f) determining which pages in the carousel are linked to by the new page; and (g) modifying metadata for the new page for each page in the carousel linked to by the new page, as included in independent claim 40.

Davis et al. at most discloses that the interactive electronic guide operates by overlaying interactive program schedule information controlled by the user over the original video signal received on a program guide channel. Davis et al. discloses producing “a composite NTSC output signal containing both the original video signal and the interactive program schedule information as controlled by the user. This composite video signal is supplied...to the television receiver 260, which the user keeps tuned to the modulated channel, for example, channel 3 or 4” (see col. 21, lines 1-8). However, this disclosed operation of Davis et al. does not teach or require automatically determining which pages in the carousel contain links to the new page, or which pages in the carousel are linked to by the new page. In fact, nothing in Davis et al. relates to the specific links between pages in the carousel.

The Office Action asserts on page 2 (emphasis added):

Davis teaches transmitting an interactive program guide to the user. An interactive program guide has interactive features which allow the user to interact with in order to obtain additional information or to allow the user to navigate through the program guide. When an interactive portion of a program guide is updated, the pages associated with the interactive portion are also updated. For example, if the user clicks on an updated link in the program guide to obtain more information, the corresponding page which is linked to the updated link is displayed. As such, Davis

certainly teaches determining which pages in the carousel contain links and are linked to the new page.

However, Davis et al. merely teaches application software for implementing or updating the interactive portion of an electronic program guide (see col. 20, lines 43-47). The specific steps of determining of which pages in a carousel contain links to a new page, modifying metadata for each page in the carousel containing links to the new page, determining which pages in a carousel are linked to by a new page, and modifying metadata for the new page for each page in the carousel linked to by the new page, as included in independent claim 40, are simply not taught or suggested by Davis et al.

Independent claim 56 includes elements similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 40 that are also not taught or suggested by Bisdikian et al. and Davis et al., alone or in combination.

Therefore, since Bisdikian et al. and Davis et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 40 and 56, these claims are allowable.

Claims 41, 47, 50 and 54-55 depend from claim 40. Claims 57 and 60 depend from claim 56. As discussed above, claims 40 and 56 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the additional features recited therein, claims 41, 47, 50, 54-55, 57 and 60 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 40-41, 47, 50, 54-57, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

#### **B. Rejections Based on Bisdikian et al. and Tanigawa et al.**

The Office Action rejects claims 48-49 and 58-59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bisdikian et al. in view of Tanigawa et al. (US 5,973,681). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Response to Office Action  
Application Number: 09/895,452  
Attorney Docket Number: 92819.02  
Filing Date: 06/29/2001

As discussed above, Bisdikian et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 40 and 56. Tanigawa et al. fails to cure this defect in Bisdikian et al.

Tanigawa et al. is directed towards a transmitting apparatus for an interactive communication system wherein two distinct storage units are utilized, where the second unit stores control information showing links between the frames of image data stored on the first storage unit and where the transmitting unit repeatedly transmits a predetermined number of frames of image data (see abstract). However, Tanigawa et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the elements of determining of which pages in a carousel contain links to a new page, modifying metadata for each page in the carousel containing links to the new page, determining which pages in a carousel are linked to by a new page, and modifying metadata for the new page for each page in the carousel linked to by the new page, as included in independent claim 40. As discussed above, independent claim 56 includes similar elements.

Therefore, since Bisdikian et al. and Tanigawa et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 40 and 56, these claims are allowable.

Claims 48-49 depend from claim 40. Claims 58-59 depend from claim 56. As discussed above, claims 40 and 56 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the additional features recited therein, claims 48-49 and 58-59 are also allowable.

Furthermore, applicants note that the rejections of claims 48-49 and 58-59 over the combination of Bisdikian et al. and Tanigawa et al. appears to be insufficient since the disclosure of Tanigawa et al. has been applied only to the specific features recited in dependent claims 48-49 and 58-59. Since these claims depend from independent claims 40 and 56, respectively, this rejection appears to be erroneous since the Office Action itself on page 3 acknowledges that several features in the respective independent claims are not disclosed by Bisdikian et al. Accordingly, this rejection is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 48-49 and 58-59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

**2. Conclusion**

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Response to Office Action  
Application Number: 09/895,452  
Attorney Docket Number: 92819.02  
Filing Date: 06/29/2001

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: December 19, 2008

By: /Sung T. Kim/

Sung T. Kim, Reg. No.: 45,398  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct telephone: (703) 647-6574  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

December 19, 2008  
Date

/Noemi Tovar/  
Noemi Tovar

Response to Office Action  
Application Number: 09/895,452  
Attorney Docket Number: 92819.02  
Filing Date: 06/29/2001